

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 30, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. The application is believed to be in allowable condition.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on May 7, 2007. In the interview, the Examiner reviewed proposed claim amendments that were submitted by the Applicant, and that are reflected in the amended claims presented herewith. Applicant believes that, based on these amendments and pending a further updated search by the examiner, the claims are in allowable condition.

The Drawings are objected to because Figures 1, 3A, 3B, 4A, and 4B are slanted on the page and the Drawing Figure 1 needs to have the shading removed. Applicant has previously amended Figures 1, 3A, 3B, 4A, and 4B, with replacement drawings submitted on November 9, 2006. During the interview the Examiner confirmed that the correct replacement drawings are in the file and that the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 11, 15, 17, 26, and 35 are objected to because the Examiner could not find "created or modified by the exception" in the specification or drawings. Claims 1, 11, 15, 17, 26, and 35 have been amended to address this objection, and are believed to be in allowable condition. Specifically support can be found in Figure 4B and in the specification on page 16, line 15 and page 17, lines 7-16.

The Specification is objected to because Pages 4 and 7 are slanted on the page and not straight. Replacement pages 4 and 7 are attached with this response.

Claims 1 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to address the 112 rejection and the term "enabling" has been removed in favor of a positive recitation in the claim limitation. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 1 and 17 are in allowable condition.

Claims 1, 11, 15, 17, 26, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amount to a gap between the elements. Claims 1, 11, 15, 17, 26, and 35 have been amended to address the 112 rejection. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 1, 11, 15, 17, 26, and 35 are in allowable condition.


U.S.S.N.: 09/496,389

Applicant: Boris V. Marchegiani

The dependent claims 4, 5, 8-11, 19-22, 24, 28, and 36-40 are believed allowable for at least the reasons that the respective base claims are now in allowable condition.

Applicant believes that the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the enclosure submitted herewith, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



---

A. Jason Mirabito, Reg. No. 28,161  
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS  
GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.  
One Financial Center  
Boston, MA 02111  
Telephone: (617) 542-6000  
Facsimile: (617) 542-2241  
**Customer No. 30623**

Dated: May 10, 2007

4030804v.1